arXiv:1601.02857v2 [math.LO] 20 Jan 2016

A Many-Sorted Variant of Japaridze's Polymodal Provability Logic*

Gerald Berger[1], Lev D. Beklemishev[2,3,4], and Hans Tompits[1]

[1]Institute for Information Systems, Vienna University of Technology
gberger@dbai.tuwien.ac.at, tompits@kr.tuwien.ac.at
[2]Steklov Mathematical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences
[3]Moscow M.V. Lomonosov State University
[4]National Research University Higher School of Economics
bekl@mi.ras.ru

Abstract

We consider a many-sorted variant of Japaridze's polymodal provability logic GLP. In this variant, propositional variables are assigned sorts $n < \omega$, where variables of sort n are arithmetically interpreted as Π_{n+1}-sentences of the arithmetical hierarchy. We prove that the many-sorted variant is arithmetically complete with respect to this interpretation.

Keywords: provability logics, mathematical logic, modal logic, formal arithmetic, arithmetical completeness

1 Introduction

The polymodal provability logic GLP, due to Japaridze [15], has received considerable interest in the mathematical-logic community. For every $n \geq 0$, the language of GLP features modalities $\langle n \rangle$ that can be arithmetically interpreted as *n-consistency*, i.e., a modal formula $\langle n \rangle \varphi$ expresses under this interpretation that φ is consistent with the set of all true Π_n-sentences. This particular interpretation steered interest in GLP in mainstream proof theory: Beklemishev [3] showed how GLP can act as a framework in order to canonically recover an ordinal notation system for Peano arithmetic (PA) and its fragments. Moreover, based on these notions, he obtained a rather abstract version of Gentzen's consistency proof for PA by transfinite induction up to ε_0 and he formulated a combinatorial statement independent from PA [5].

This proof-theoretic analysis is based on the notion of *graded provability algebra*. Let T be an extension of PA and $\mathcal{L}_T$ be an algebra whose elements are equivalence classes of the relation

$$\varphi \sim \psi \iff_{df} T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi.$$

Furthermore, let $\{\varphi\}$ denote the equivalence class of φ with respect to $\sim$. Equipping $\mathcal{L}_T$ with the standard Boolean connectives and the relation

$$\{\varphi\} \leq \{\psi\} \iff_{df} T \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$$

*This work was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grants Y698 and W1255-N23. The article is currently under review for publication in the Logic Journal of the IGPL.

turns $\mathcal{L}_T$ into a Boolean algebra, the *Lindenbaum algebra of* T. Thus, logical notions are brought into an algebraic setting. The maximal element $\top$ and the minimal element $\bot$ of this algebra are, respectively, the classes of all provable and all refutable sentences of T. Deductively closed extensions of T correspond to *filters* of $\mathcal{L}_T$ (see ref. [4] for details).

Let $\langle n\rangle_T$ be a Π_{n+1}-formula that formalizes the notion of n-consistency in arithmetic. The *graded provability algebra* $\mathcal{M}_T$ of T is the algebra $\mathcal{L}_T$ extended by operators $\langle n\rangle_T$ defined on the elements of $\mathcal{L}_T$ by

$$\langle n\rangle_T\colon \{\varphi\} \longmapsto \{\langle n\rangle_T\varphi\}, \quad \text{for } n \geq 0.$$

Terms in the language of $\mathcal{M}_T$ can be identified with polymodal formulas. Furthermore, for each sound and axiomatizable extension T of PA, Japaridze's arithmetical completeness theorem for GLP states that

$$\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi(\vec{p}) \iff \mathcal{M}_T \models \forall\vec{p}\,(\varphi(\vec{p}) = \top),$$

where $\vec{p}$ are all the propositional variables from $\varphi(\vec{p})$. The algebra $\mathcal{M}_T$ carries an additional structure in form of a distinguished family of subsets

$$P_0 \subset P_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{M}_T,$$

where P_n is defined by the class of Π_{n+1}-sentences of the arithmetical hierarchy. This family of subsets is called *stratification of* $\mathcal{M}_T$ [3]. Since $\langle n\rangle_T$ is a Π_{n+1}-formula, the operator $\langle n\rangle_T$ maps $\mathcal{M}_T$ to P_n. The presence of a stratification admits to turn $\mathcal{M}_T$ into a many-sorted algebra—variables of sort n range over arithmetical Π_{n+1}-sentences. The notion of sort can be naturally extended to capture polymodal terms. It is the goal of this paper to investigate a modal-logical counterpart to this many-sorted algebra.

To this end, we define a many-sorted variant of GLP, denoted by GLP^*, which has variables of sort n, for every $n \geq 0$. Substitution in this logic is required to respect the sorts of variables. Our main result is a Solovay-style arithmetical completeness theorem for GLP^*, i.e., for any sound and axiomatizable extension T of PA we have

$$\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi(\vec{p}) \iff \mathcal{M}_T \models \forall\vec{p}\,(\varphi(\vec{p}) = \top),$$

where $\vec{p}$ are all propositional variables from $\varphi(\vec{p})$ and a quantifier binding such a variable of sort n only ranges over elements from P_n. In particular, we show that the principle of Σ_{n+1}-*completeness*,

$$\langle n\rangle_T p \to p$$

(where p is of sort n), in addition to the postulates of GLP, suffices to obtain arithmetical completeness. A logic that contains this principle has been studied by Visser [18] who introduced a Σ_1-provability logic of PA, i.e., in this logic, variables are arithmetically interpreted as Σ_1-sentences (see also Boolos [12] and Ardeshir and Mojtahedi [1]).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. After this introductory section, we introduce basic notions in Section 2. In Section 3 we prove the arithmetical completeness theorem for GLP^*. We continue our exposition with some further results in Section 4 and conclude the paper in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

The Logics GLP, GLP*, and J*. The polymodal provability logic GLP is formulated in the language of the propositional calculus enriched by unary connectives $\langle 0\rangle, \langle 1\rangle, \langle 2\rangle, \ldots$, called

modalities. The dual connectives $[n]$, for every $n \geq 0$, are abbreviations where $[n]\varphi$ stands for $\neg\langle n\rangle\neg\varphi$. The notion of a *formula* is defined in the usual way. The logic GLP is axiomatized by the following axiom schemes and rules:[1]

(i) all tautologies of classical propositional logic;

(ii) $\langle n\rangle(\varphi \vee \psi) \to \langle n\rangle\varphi \vee \langle n\rangle\psi$; $\quad [n]\top$;

(iii) $\langle n\rangle\varphi \to \langle n\rangle(\varphi \wedge \langle n\rangle\neg\varphi)$ (Löb's axiom);

(iv) $\langle m\rangle\varphi \to [n]\langle m\rangle\varphi$, for $m < n$;

(v) $\langle n\rangle\varphi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$, for $m < n$ (*monotonicity*); and

(vi) modus ponens and $\varphi \to \psi / \langle n\rangle\varphi \to \langle n\rangle\psi$.

GLP^* is formulated over a propositional language that contains variables each being assigned a unique *sort* α, where $0 \leq \alpha \leq \omega$. By writing p^α, we indicate that the variable p^α has sort α. The notion of sort is defined for all formulas as follows:

(i) $\top$ and $\bot$ have sort 0;

(ii) $\varphi \wedge \psi$ and $\varphi \vee \psi$ have sort $\max\{\alpha, \beta\}$ if φ and ψ have the respective sorts α and β;

(iii) $\neg\varphi$ has sort $\alpha + 1$ if φ has sort α; and

(iv) $\langle n\rangle\varphi$ has sort n, for $n < \omega$.

We denote by $|\varphi|$ the sort of φ. The sort ω is explicitly included to provide variables that can explicitly be assigned an arbitrary arithmetical sentence in an arithmetical interpretation. In contrast, variables of finite $n < \omega$ can be assigned arithmetical Π_{n+1}-sentences (see below). Note that if $|\neg\varphi| = \alpha$, then α is a successor ordinal.

The logic GLP^* is now axiomatized by the following axiom schemes and rules of inference:

(i) all tautologies of classical propositional logic;

(ii) schemes (i), (ii), (iii), and (v) of GLP;

(iii) $\langle n\rangle\varphi \to \varphi$, if $|\varphi| \leq n$ (Σ_{n+1}-*completeness*).

Note that, for $m < n$, $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \langle n\rangle\neg\langle m\rangle\varphi \to \neg\langle m\rangle\varphi$, whence $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \langle m\rangle\varphi \to [n]\langle m\rangle\varphi$ follows by propositional logic. Hence, GLP^* extends GLP in the sense that, for any formula φ in the language of GLP, if $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi$, then $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi'$, where φ' is obtained from φ by arbitrarily assigning sorts to propositional variables.

The logic GLP is not complete for any class of Kripke frames [14]. Therefore, Beklemishev [6] considers a weaker logic J that is complete with respect to a natural class of Kripke frame and to which GLP is reducible. We do so as well and define a many-sorted counterpart J^* of J which arises from GLP^* by dropping monotonicity and adding the scheme

(vii) $\langle m\rangle\langle n\rangle\varphi \to \langle m\rangle\varphi$, for $m < n$.

It is easy to see that this scheme is provable in GLP^*, i.e., GLP^* extends J^*.

[1] Usually, GLP is axiomatized by using $[n]$ instead of $\langle n\rangle$. However, it is more convenient for our purposes to use $\langle n\rangle$, since we focus on Π_{n+1}-axiomatized concepts. Note that GLP is closed under the *necessitation rule*: if $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi$ then $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash [n]\varphi$.

Kripke Models. A *Kripke frame* is a structure $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}\rangle$, where W is a non-empty set of *worlds* and R_k, for $k \geq 0$, are binary relations on W. $\mathfrak{A}$ is called *finite* if W is finite and $R_k = \varnothing$ for almost every $k \geq 0$.

A *valuation* $[\![\cdot]\!]$ on a frame $\mathfrak{A}$ maps every propositional variable p to a subset $[\![p]\!] \subseteq W$. A *Kripke model* is a Kripke frame together with a valuation on it. Given any Kripke model $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$, we extend the valuation $[\![\cdot]\!]$ recursively to the class of all polymodal formulas:

(i) $[\![\top]\!] = W$; $\quad [\![\bot]\!] = \varnothing$;

(ii) $[\![\psi \wedge \chi]\!] = [\![\psi]\!] \cap [\![\chi]\!]$;

(iii) $[\![\neg\psi]\!] = W \setminus [\![\psi]\!]$, and similarly for the other propositional connectives; and

(iv) $[\![\langle n\rangle\psi]\!] = \{x \in W \mid \exists y\,(xR_n y \;\&\; y \in [\![\psi]\!])\}$.

We often write $\mathfrak{A}, x \models \varphi$ instead of $x \in [\![\varphi]\!]$. Similarly, we also write $x \Vdash \varphi$ instead of $x \in [\![\varphi]\!]$ when $\mathfrak{A}$ is clear from the context. We say that φ is *valid in* $\mathfrak{A}$, denoted by $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$, if $\mathfrak{A}, x \models \varphi$ for every $x \in W$.

A binary relation R on W is *conversely well-founded* if there is no infinite chain of elements of W of the form $x_0 R x_1 R x_2 \ldots$. It is easy to see that, for finite W, this condition is equivalent to R being irreflexive. A Kripke frame $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}\rangle$ is called a J^**-frame* if

(i) R_k is conversely well-founded and transitive, for all $k \geq 0$;

(ii) $\forall x, y\,(xR_n y \Rightarrow \forall z\,(xR_m z \Leftrightarrow yR_m z))$, for $m < n$; and

(iii) $\forall x, y, z\,(xR_m y \;\&\; yR_n z \Rightarrow xR_m z)$, for $m < n$.

A J^**-model* is a Kripke model that is based on a J^*-frame. Such a model $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ is called *strongly persistent* if it satisfies the following two conditions:

(i) if $|p| \leq n$ and $y \Vdash p$, then $x \Vdash p$ whenever $xR_n y$; and

(ii) if $|p| < n$ and $y \nVdash p$, then $x \nVdash p$ whenever $xR_n y$.

The following facts are easy to establish.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ be a J^*-model. Then, $\mathfrak{A}$ is strongly persistent iff for all formulas φ and all $n \geq 0$ we have*

(i) *if $|\varphi| \leq n$, then $xR_n y$ and $y \Vdash \varphi$ imply $x \Vdash \varphi$; and*

(ii) *if $|\varphi| < n$, then $xR_n y$ and $y \nVdash \varphi$ imply $x \nVdash \varphi$.*

Lemma 2.2. *The axiom scheme $\langle n\rangle\varphi \to \varphi$ is valid in a J^*-model $\mathfrak{A}$ for all φ such that $|\varphi| \leq n$ iff $\mathfrak{A}$ is strongly persistent.*

Theorem 2.3. *For any formula φ, $\mathsf{J}^* \vdash \varphi$ iff φ is valid in all finite, strongly persistent J^*-models.*

Proof (Sketch). The soundness direction is a straightforward induction on proof length. For completeness, the standard methods used to construct canonical Kripke models can be used to show that J^* is complete for the class of finite and strongly persistent J^*-models. Roughly, the argument can be sketched as follows.

We define an operator $\sim$, called *modified negation*, for all formulas φ as follows:

$$\sim\varphi = \begin{cases} \psi, & \text{if } \varphi = \neg\psi \text{ for some } \psi, \\ \neg\varphi, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For a set Δ of formulas, we define $\ell(\Delta) \coloneqq \{n \mid \langle n\rangle\varphi \in \Delta \text{ for some } \varphi\}$. Following [6], we say that a set Δ of formulas is *adequate* if $\top \in \Delta$ and it is closed under subformulas, modified negations, and the operations

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n\rangle\varphi, \langle m\rangle\psi \in \Delta &\;\Rightarrow\; \langle m\rangle\varphi \in \Delta, \\ p^m \in \Delta, n \in \ell(\Delta) &\;\Rightarrow\; \langle n\rangle p^m \in \Delta, \quad \text{for all variables } p^m \text{ and } n \geq m, \text{ and} \\ \neg p^m \in \Delta, n \in \ell(\Delta) &\;\Rightarrow\; \langle n\rangle \neg p^m \in \Delta, \quad \text{for all variables } p^m \text{ and } n > m. \end{aligned}$$

We can easily convince ourselves that any finite set Γ can be extended to a finite set Γ' which is adequate and such that $\ell(\Gamma) = \ell(\Gamma')$.

Let us now fix a finite adequate set Δ and assume that all modalities range within $\Lambda \coloneqq \ell(\Delta)$. Define a Kripke frame $\mathfrak{F}_\Delta = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}\rangle$, where

$$W \coloneqq \{x \mid x \text{ is a maximal } \mathsf{J}^*\text{-consistent subset of } \Delta\},$$

for $n \in \Lambda$ and $x, y \in W$, and xR_ny holds if the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) For any $\varphi \in y$, if $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in \Delta$ then $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in x$.

(ii) For any $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in \Delta$, we have that $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in y$ implies $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in x$.

(iii) For any $\langle m\rangle\varphi \in \Delta$ such that $m < n$, we have $\langle m\rangle\varphi \in x \iff \langle m\rangle\varphi \in y$.

(iv) There exists a formula $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in \Delta$ such that $\langle n\rangle\varphi \in x \setminus y$.

For any natural number $n \notin \Lambda$, set $R_n \coloneqq \varnothing$. Furthermore, define a Kripke model $\mathfrak{A}_\Delta = \langle \mathfrak{F}_\Delta, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$, where

$$\mathfrak{A}_\Delta, x \models p \iff_{df} p \in x$$

for all variables $p \in \Delta$ and $x \in W$. It can be shown that, for all $\varphi \in \Delta$,

$$\mathfrak{A}_\Delta, x \models \varphi \iff \varphi \in x.$$

Moreover, using the axioms of Σ_n-completeness, $\mathfrak{A}_\Delta$ can be easily shown to be a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model.

Using these facts, completeness follows in the usual way. Suppose $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash \varphi$. Then $\{\sim\varphi\}$ is J^*-consistent. Let Δ be the smallest finite adequate set containing φ. Then $\mathfrak{A}_\Delta$ is a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model. There is a maximal J^*-consistent set $x \subseteq \Delta$ such that $\sim\varphi \in x$, whence $\mathfrak{K}_\Delta, x \not\models \varphi$.[2] □

Formal Arithmetic. We consider first-order theories in the language $\mathcal{L}_0 = (0, +, \cdot, s)$ of arithmetic (where s is a unary function symbol for the successor function). Theories and formulas formulated in (an extension of) this language will be called *arithmetical*. The theories we consider will be extensions of *Peano arithmetic* (PA). It will be convenient to assume that the language

[2] A detailed proof can be found in the work of Berger [11].

of PA contains terms for all primitive recursive functions. It is well-known that PA can be conservatively extended so as to contain definitions of all these terms. The class of Δ_0-*formulas* are all formulas where each occurrence of a quantifier is of either forms

$$\forall x \leq t\, \varphi \coloneqq \forall x\, (x \leq t \to \varphi),$$
$$\exists x \leq t\, \varphi \coloneqq \exists x\, (x \leq t \wedge \varphi),$$

where t is a term over $\mathcal{L}_0$ that has no occurrence of the variable x. Occurrences of such quantifiers are called *bounded*. The classes of Σ_n- and Π_n-formulas are defined inductively: Δ_0-formulas are Σ_0- and Π_0-formulas. If $\varphi(\vec{x}, y)$ is a Π_n-formula, then $\exists y\, \varphi(\vec{x}, y)$ is a Σ_{n+1}-formula. Similarly, if $\varphi(\vec{x}, y)$ is a Σ_n-formula, then $\forall y\, \varphi(\vec{x}, y)$ is a Π_{n+1}-formula. When an arithmetical theory T is given, we often identify these classes modulo provable equivalence in T.

We recursively define $\overline{0} \coloneqq 0$ and $\overline{n+1} \coloneqq s(\overline{n})$. The expression $\overline{n}$ is called the *n-th numeral* and represents the number n in $\mathcal{L}_0$. We assume a standard global assignment $\ulcorner \cdot \urcorner$ of expressions (terms, formulas, etc.) to natural numbers. Given any expression τ, we call $\ulcorner \tau \urcorner$ the *code* or *Gödel number of* τ. Note that $\ulcorner \tau \urcorner$, being a natural number, "lives" in our informal metatheory and has a natural representation in $\mathcal{L}_0$ through the term $\overline{\ulcorner \tau \urcorner}$. However, when presenting formulas in the arithmetical language, we usually write $\ulcorner \tau \urcorner$ instead of $\overline{\ulcorner \tau \urcorner}$. We often consider primitive recursive families of formulas φ_n that depend on a parameter $n \in \omega$. In this context, $\ulcorner \varphi_x \urcorner$ denotes a primitive recursive definable term with free variable x whose value for a given n is the Gödel number of φ_n. In particular, the expression $\ulcorner \varphi(\dot{x}) \urcorner$ denotes a primitive recursive definable term whose value given any n is the Gödel number of $\varphi(\overline{n})$, i.e., the Gödel number of the formula resulting from φ when substituting the term $\overline{n}$ for x. Following [7], it is convenient to assume a second sort of first-order variables, denoted $\alpha, \beta, \ldots$, that range over codes of arithmetical formulas. Formulas containing such variables can be naturally translated into the one-sorted setting by making use of a primitive recursive predicate that defines the notion of "being a formula."

A theory T is *sound* if $T \vdash \varphi$ implies $\mathbb{N} \models \varphi$, for every arithmetical sentence φ. For an axiomatizable extension T of PA, we denote by $\Box_T(\alpha)$ the formula that formalizes the notion of provability in T in the usual sense. We write $\Box_T\varphi$ instead of $\Box_T(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$. The formula $\Box_T$ defines the standard Gödelian provability predicate for T. More generally, given a formula $\mathsf{Prv}(\alpha)$ with one free variable α, we say that Prv is a *provability predicate of level n over T*, if for all arithmetical sentences φ, ψ:

(i) Prv is a Σ_{n+1}-formula;

(ii) $T \vdash \varphi$ implies $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$;

(iii) $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \varphi \to \psi \urcorner) \to (\mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \to \mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \psi \urcorner))$; and

(iv) if φ is a Σ_{n+1}-sentence, then $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \varphi \to \mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$.

It is well-known that $\Box_T$, in its standard formulation, is a provability predicate of level 0. A provability predicate Prv is *sound* if $\mathbb{N} \models \mathsf{Prv}(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$ implies $\mathbb{N} \models \varphi$, for every arithmetical sentence φ. A sequence π of formulas $\mathsf{Prv}_0, \mathsf{Prv}_1, \ldots$ is a *strong sequence of provability predicates over T* if there is a sequence $r_0 < r_1 < \cdots$ of natural numbers such that, for all $n \geq 0$,

(i) Prv_n is a provability predicate of level r_n over T; and

(ii) $T \vdash \mathsf{Prv}_n(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner) \to \mathsf{Prv}_{n+1}(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$, for any arithmetical sentence φ.

We denote Prv_n by $[n]_\pi$ and abbreviate $[n]_\pi(\ulcorner \varphi \urcorner)$ by $[n]_\pi\varphi$. Moreover, the dual of $[n]_\pi$ is defined by $\langle n \rangle_\pi \varphi \coloneqq \neg[n]_\pi \neg\varphi$. Given such a sequence π, we denote by $|\pi_n|$ the level of the n-th provability

predicate of π.

Since provability predicate $[n]_\pi$ from π is a Σ_k-sentence for some $k > 0$, we can associate (in analogy to the standard Gödelian provability predicate) a predicate $\mathsf{Prf}_n(\alpha, y)$ which expresses the statement "y codes a proof of α" and

$$T \vdash \mathsf{Prv}_n(\alpha) \leftrightarrow \exists y\, \mathsf{Prf}_n(\alpha, y).$$

We stress that Prf_n is chosen in such a way such that every number y codes a proof of at most one formula and that every provable formula has arbitrarily long proofs.

We denote by $\mathsf{True}_{\Pi_n}(\alpha)$ the well-known truth-definition for the class of all Π_n-sentences, i.e., $\mathsf{True}_{\Pi_n}(\alpha)$ expresses the fact "*α is the Gödel number of a true arithmetical Π_n-sentence.*" The truth-definition for Π_n-sentences serves as a basis for a natural strong sequence of provability predicates. Let $[0]_T \coloneqq \Box_T$ and

$$[n+1]_T(\alpha) \coloneqq \exists\beta\, (\mathsf{True}_{\Pi_n}(\beta) \wedge \Box_T(\beta \to \alpha)), \quad \text{for } n \geq 0.$$

The formula $[n]_T$ is a provability predicate of level n. It formalizes the notion of being provable in the theory $T + \mathsf{Th}_{\Pi_n}(\mathbb{N})$, where $\mathsf{Th}_{\Pi_n}(\mathbb{N})$ is the set of all true Π_n-sentences.

Another strong sequence of provability predicates is defined by $[0]_\omega \coloneqq \Box_{\mathsf{PA}}$ and

$$[n+1]_\omega \coloneqq \exists\beta\, (\forall x\, [n]_\omega\beta(\dot{x}) \wedge [n]_\omega(\forall x\, \beta(x) \to \alpha)), \quad \text{for } n \geq 0.$$

The predicate $[n]_\omega$ is of level $2n$ and formalizes the notion of *provability by n applications of the ω-rule*. Japaridze originally showed arithmetical completeness for this arithmetical interpretation, while completeness with respect to the broader class of arithmetical interpretations, defined by strong sequences of provability predicates, was later established by Ignatiev [14].[3]

Arithmetical Interpretation. Let π be a strong sequence of provability predicates over T. An (*arithmetical*) *realization* (*over* π) is a function f_π that maps propositional variables to arithmetical sentences. The realization f_π is *typed* if $f_\pi(p)$ is an arithmetical $\Pi_{|\pi_n|+1}$-sentence, provided $n = |p| < \omega$. Any realization f_π can be uniquely extended to a map $\hat{f}_\pi$ that captures all polymodal formulas as follows:

(i) $\hat{f}_\pi(\bot) = \bot$; $\hat{f}_\pi(\top) = \top$, where $\bot$ (resp., $\top$) is a convenient contradictory (resp., tautological) statement in the language of arithmetic;

(ii) $\hat{f}_\pi(p) = f_\pi(p)$, for any propositional variable p;

(iii) $\hat{f}_\pi(\cdot)$ commutes with the propositional connectives; and

(iv) $\hat{f}_\pi(\langle n\rangle\varphi) = \langle n\rangle_\pi \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$, for all $n \geq 0$.

By some simple closure properties of the class of Π_n-sentences, its follows that $|\varphi| = n$ implies that $\hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$ is provably equivalent to a $\Pi_{|\pi_n|+1}$-sentence in T. Using this, we readily observe:

Lemma 2.4. *If $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi$, then $T \vdash \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$ for all typed arithmetical realizations f_π over π.*

Proof. The lemma is shown by induction on the length of a proof of φ in GLP^*. Most of the axioms are clear. In particular, the provability of the instances Löb's axiom is well-known. The axiom of Σ_{n+1}-completeness follows from our discussion above. The induction step, i.e., closure under the rules of inference, is easy to establish. We leave the details to the reader. □

[3] See Artemov and Beklemishev [2] for a brief historical background.

Hence, GLP^* is sound for the arithmetical semantics thus defined. Completeness holds under the additional assumption of soundness of the provability predicates involved. Arithmetical completeness for GLP^* has first been established by Japaridze [15] and has been significantly extended and simplified by Ignatiev [14]. Beklemishev [7] provided yet another simplified proof for the arithmetical completeness theorem for GLP^* that is close to Solovay's original construction for the logic GL. The next section will be devoted to the proof of the arithmetical completeness theorem for GLP^*. To this end, we are going to extend the construction for GLP described in ref. [7].

3 Arithmetical Completeness

Arithmetical completeness proofs usually rely on reasonable Kripke semantics, since those proofs usually establish the following fact: if φ is a formula that has a Kripke model falsifying φ in a certain world, one can find an arithmetical realization such that the arithmetical theory under consideration does not prove φ under this realization. Since GLP is, however, not complete for any class of Kripke frames, Beklemishev reduces GLP to J and relies on the Kripke semantics of J in order to prove arithmetical completeness. We proceed analogously in the following.

To this end, we define formulas $M(\varphi)$ and $M^+(\varphi)$ as follows [7]. Consider an enumeration $\langle m_1\rangle\varphi_1, \langle m_2\rangle\varphi_2, \ldots, \langle m_s\rangle\varphi_s$ of all subformulas of φ of the form $\langle k\rangle\psi$ and let $n \coloneqq \max_{i\leq s} m_i$. Define

$$M(\varphi) \coloneqq \bigwedge_{\substack{1\leq i\leq s\\ m_i<j\leq n}} (\langle j\rangle\varphi_i \to \langle m_i\rangle\varphi_i),$$

and, furthermore,

$$M^+(\varphi) \coloneqq M(\varphi) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\leq n} [i]M(\varphi).$$

By the monotonicity axioms, it is clear that $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash M^+(\varphi)$. We are going to prove the following statement.

Theorem 3.1. *Let T be a sound axiomatizable extension of PA and π a strong sequence of provability predicates over T of which every provability predicate is sound. Then, for all many-sorted formulas φ, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi$;

(ii) $\mathsf{J}^* \vdash M^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$; *and*

(iii) $T \vdash \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$, *for all typed realizations f_π.*

Before turning to the proof of this theorem, let us introduce some additional notions. A *root* of a J^*-model $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ is a world $r \in W$ such that for all $x \in W$ there is a $k \geq 0$ such that rR_kx or $r = x$. A model which has a root is called *rooted*. The following lemma can be proved similarly as in ref. [7].

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\varphi \in L^*$, if $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash \varphi$ then there is a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model $\mathfrak{A}$ with root r such that $\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models \varphi$.*

We proceed with the proof of Theorem 3.1. The direction from (ii) to (i) is immediate since GLP^* extends J^* and $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash M^+(\varphi)$. Furthermore, the direction from (i) to (iii) is the arithmetical

soundness of GLP^* (Lemma 2.4). We show that (iii) implies (ii) by assuming the contrapositive, i.e., assume that $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash M^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$. Then there is a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R'_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ with root r such that $\mathfrak{A}, r \models M^+(\varphi)$ and $\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models \varphi$. Without loss of generality, assume that $W = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ for some $N \geq 1$ and $r = 1$. We define a new model $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \langle W_0, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$, where

(i) $W_0 = \{0\} \cup W$;

(ii) $R_0 = \{(0, x) \mid x \in W\} \cup R'_0$;

(iii) $R_k = R'_k$, for $k > 0$; and

(iv) $\mathfrak{A}_0, 0 \models p \iff_{df} \mathfrak{A}, 1 \models p$, for all variables p.

Notice that $\mathfrak{A}_0$ is still a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model such that $\mathfrak{A}_0, r \not\models M^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$. Let m be the least number such that $R_m \neq \varnothing$ and $R_k = \varnothing$ for all $k > m$. As in ref. [7], we define the following auxiliary notions:

$$\begin{aligned} R_k(x) &:= \{y \mid xR_k y\}, \\ R^*_k(x) &:= \{y \mid y \in R_i(x), \text{ for some } i \geq k\}, \text{ and} \\ R^\circ_k(x) &:= R^*_k(x) \cup \bigcup \{R^*_k(z) \mid x \in R^*_{k+1}(z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, Solovay functions $h_n : \omega \to W_0$ are defined for all $n \leq m$ as follows:

$$h_0(0) = 0 \text{ and } h_n(0) = \ell_{n-1}, \text{ for } n > 0;$$

$$h_n(x+1) = \begin{cases} y, & \text{if } h_n(x) R_n z \text{ and } \mathsf{Prf}_n(\ulcorner \neg S_z \urcorner, x), \\ h_n(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here, $\ell_k = x$ is a formalization of the statement that the function h_k (defined by a formula $H_k(x, y)$) has as its *limit* at x, i.e.,

$$\ell_k = x \iff_{df} \exists N_0 \, \forall n \geq N_0 \, H_k(n, x).$$

The defining formulas H_k can be constructed via a diagonalization argument; see [7] for details. For $x \in W_0$, S_x denotes the sentence $\ell_m = \overline{x}$. The following lemmas are established in ref. [7].

Lemma 3.3. *For all $k \geq 0$,*

(i) $T \vdash \forall x \, \exists! w \in W_0 : H_k(x, \overline{w})$;

(ii) $T \vdash \exists! w \in W_0 : \ell_k = \overline{w}$;

(iii) $T \vdash \forall i, j \, \forall z \in W_0 \, (i < j \wedge h_k(i) = \overline{z} \to h_k(j) \in R_k(z) \cup \{z\})$; *and*

(iv) $T \vdash \forall z \in W_0 \, (\exists x \, h_k(x) = \overline{z} \to \ell_m \in R^*_k(z) \cup \{z\})$.

Lemma 3.4. *The following conditions hold for the sentences S_x:*

(i) $T \vdash \bigvee_{x \in W_0} S_x$ *and* $T \vdash \neg(S_x \wedge S_y)$ *for all* $x \neq y$;

(ii) $T \vdash S_x \to \langle k \rangle_\pi S_y$, *for all y such that $xR_k y$;*

(iii) $T \vdash S_x \to [k]_\pi (\ell_m \in R^\circ_k(x))$, *for all $x \neq 0$; and*

(iv) $\mathbb{N} \models S_0$.

Lemma 3.5. *For all $k < m$, provably in T,*

(i) *either $\ell_k = \ell_{k+1}$ or $\ell_k R_{k+1} \ell_{k+1}$; and*

(ii) *if $k < n \leq m$, then either $\ell_k = \ell_n$ or $\ell_k R_j \ell_n$, for some $j \in (k, n]$.*

Proof. Item (i) is clear from Lemma 3.3. Item (ii) is proved by an external induction on n from (i). □

Lemma 3.6. *For the arithmetical realization f_π defined by*

$$f_\pi : p \longmapsto \bigvee_{x \Vdash p} S_x$$

it holds that $T \nvdash \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$.

Proof (Sketch). Lemma 3.6 can be proved by first establishing Solovay's "commutation lemma" which says that, for each world $x \neq 0$ and each subformula χ of φ, it holds that

(i) if $\mathfrak{A}_0, x \models \chi$, then $T \vdash S_x \to \hat{f}_\pi(\chi)$; and

(ii) if $\mathfrak{A}_0, x \not\models \chi$, then $T \vdash S_x \to \neg \hat{f}_\pi(\chi)$.

Indeed, now suppose that $T \vdash \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$. Then $\mathfrak{A}, 1 \not\models \varphi$ implies that $T \vdash S_1 \to \neg \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$. Hence, $T \vdash \neg S_1$ and so $T \vdash \neg \langle 0 \rangle_\pi S_1$, whence $T \vdash \neg S_0$ by item (ii) of Lemma 3.4. This contradicts item (iv) of Lemma 3.4. □

It therefore suffices to show that f_π is a typed arithmetical realization using the assumption that $\mathfrak{A}_0$ is a strongly persistent J^*-model. To this end, we assume a natural arithmetization of the forcing relation $\Vdash$ on $\mathfrak{A}_0$ by bounded formulas.

Lemma 3.7. *For any variable p of sort $k \leq m$, provably in T,*

$$f_\pi(p) \iff \forall w \in W_0 \setminus [\![p]\!] : \forall x \, \neg H_k(x, \overline{w}).$$

Proof. For the direction from left to right, we reason in T as follows. Assume $f_\pi(p)$ and, towards a contradiction, suppose that $\exists x \, h_k(x) = \overline{w}$ for some $w \in W_0$ such that $w \nVdash p$. By item (iv) of Lemma 3.3, we know that, provably in T, $\exists x \, h_k(x) = \overline{u}$ implies

$$S_u \vee \bigvee_{z \in R_k^*(u)} S_z,$$

for any $u \in W_0$. In particular, we infer

$$S_w \vee \bigvee_{u \in R_k^*(w)} S_u.$$

Since $\mathfrak{A}_0$ is strongly persistent and $w \nVdash p$, we know that $u \nVdash p$ for all $u \in R_k^*(w)$. This contradicts $f_\pi(p)$ by item (i) of Lemma 3.4.

For the other direction, we reason in T as follows. Assume the right-hand side of the equivalence. We certainly know that $\neg S_u$ for all $u \in W_0$ such that $u \nVdash p$. Now, if $\ell_k = \ell_m$, then, by item (i) of Lemma 3.4, S_x for some $x \in W_0$ such that $x \Vdash p$ and we are thus finished. So

suppose that $\ell_k \neq \ell_m$. We know that $\ell_k \Vdash p$, since $\forall x\, h_k(x) \neq \overline{w}$ for all $w \Vdash \neg p$. Assume now that $\ell_m \Vdash \neg p$. By Lemma 3.5, there must be a $j \in (k, m]$ such that $\ell_k R_j \ell_m$. By strong persistence, for any $x, y \in W_0$ such that xR_jy, it holds that

$$y \nVdash p \implies x \nVdash p.$$

Thus, $\ell_m \Vdash \neg p$ is impossible and therefore $\ell_m \Vdash p$ by item (i) of Lemma 3.4. □

Lemma 3.8. *For every variable p^k, where $k < \omega$, $f_\pi(p^k)$ is $\Pi_{|\pi_k|+1}$ in T.*

Proof. Note that $H_k(x, y)$ can be defined $\Delta_{|\pi_k|+1}$ in T, since Prf_k is $\Pi_{|\pi_k|}$ in T and, moreover, $T \vdash \forall x \exists y!\, H_k(x, y)$. Now, if $k > m$ then the sentence $f_\pi(p^k)$ is a disjunction of sentences which are $\Sigma_{|\pi_k|+2}$ in T. Since $T \vdash \exists! w \in W_0 \colon \ell_m = \overline{w}$ (item (i) of Lemma 3.4) we know that, provably in T,

$$f_\pi(p^k) \iff \bigvee_{x \Vdash p} S_x \iff \bigwedge_{x \nVdash p} \neg S_x,$$

i.e., $f_\pi(p^k)$ is $\Pi_{|\pi_k|+2}$ in T as required, since it is provably equivalent to a conjunction of sentences which are $\Pi_{|\pi_k|+2}$ in T.

If $k \leq m$, then by Lemma 3.7 we know that, provably in T,

$$f_\pi(p) \iff \forall w \in W_0 \setminus [\![p]\!] \colon \forall x\, \neg H_k(x, \overline{w}),$$

which is visibly $\Pi_{|\pi_k|+1}$ in T. □

Therefore, f_π defines a typed arithmetical realization as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

4 Further Results

In this section, we briefly comment on some additional results concerning GLP^*. For a detailed exposition, we refer the interested reader to Berger [11].

Truth Provability Logic. By the *truth provability logic* GLPS we understand the set of all modal formulas in the language of GLP that are true in the standard model of arithmetic under every arithmetical realization (see ref. Beklemishev [7], Ignatiev [14], Japaridze [15]). The methods above can be easily extended to characterize a many-sorted analogue of GLPS, which we denote by GLPS^*. More precisely, let GLPS^* denote the logic consisting of the set of theorems of GLP^* extended by the schema $\varphi \to \langle n \rangle \varphi$ $(n \geq 0)$ and with modus ponens as its sole rule of inference. Let $\langle n_1 \rangle \varphi_1, \ldots, \langle n_s \rangle \varphi_s$ be an enumeration of all subformulas from φ of the form $\langle k \rangle \psi$. Let

$$H(\varphi) \coloneqq \bigwedge_{i=1}^{s} (\varphi_i \to \langle n_i \rangle \varphi_i).$$

The following theorem can be proved as in ref. [7].

Theorem 4.1. *Let T be a sound axiomatizable extension of PA and π a strong sequence of provability predicates over T of which every provability predicate is sound. Then, for all many-sorted formulas φ, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathsf{GLPS}^* \vdash \varphi$;

(ii) $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash H(\varphi) \to \varphi$; *and*

(iii) $\mathbb{N} \models \hat{f}_\pi(\varphi)$, *for all typed realizations* f_π.

Reduction of GLP* to GLP. Note that Theorem 3.1 yields a reduction from GLP^* to J^*. However, the formula $M^+(\varphi)$ is, in a sense, inconvenient since its size does not depend on the size of φ and, additionally, $M^+(\varphi)$ is not necessarily in the language of φ. We borrow a result from [10] to improve upon that. Let $\langle m_1\rangle\varphi_1, \langle m_2\rangle\varphi_2, \ldots, \langle m_s\rangle\varphi_s$ be an enumeration of all subformulas of φ of the form $\langle k\rangle\psi$ such that $i < j$ implies $m_i \leq m_j$. Define

$$N(\varphi) \coloneqq \bigwedge_{\substack{1\leq i\leq s\\ i<j\leq s}} (\langle m_j\rangle\varphi_j \to \langle m_i\rangle\varphi_i).$$

Furthermore, let

$$N^+(\varphi) \coloneqq N(\varphi) \wedge \bigwedge_{1\leq i\leq s} [m_i]\varphi.$$

Lemma 4.2. *For all formulas* φ,

$$\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi \iff \mathsf{J}^* \vdash N^+(\varphi) \to \varphi.$$

Proof. The direction from right to left is immediate, since $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash N^+(\varphi)$. For the other direction, suppose that $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash N^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$. Then there is a finite and strongly persistent J^*-model $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_n\}_{n\geq 0}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ with root r such that $\mathfrak{A}, r \models N^+(\varphi)$ and $\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models \varphi$. Modify $\mathfrak{A}$ by stipulating that $R_k = \varnothing$ for all natural numbers k such that $\langle k\rangle$ does not occur in φ. It is clear that $\mathfrak{A}, r \models N^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$, since $N^+(\varphi)$ contains the same modalities as φ. We show that $\mathfrak{A}, r \models M^+(\varphi)$. Let $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and consider any j such that $m_i < j \leq n$. Now $\mathfrak{A}, r \models \langle j\rangle\varphi_i$ only if $j = m_k$ for some $k = 1, \ldots, s$. In this case, $\mathfrak{A}, r \models \langle m_i\rangle\varphi$ since $\mathfrak{A}, r \models N^+(\varphi)$. Otherwise, if $j \neq m_k$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, s$, then trivially $\mathfrak{A}, r \models \langle j\rangle\varphi_i \to \langle m_i\rangle\varphi_i$, since $\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models \langle j\rangle\varphi_i$ due to the fact that $R_j = \varnothing$. Let $n \coloneqq \max_{i\leq s} m_i$ and consider any $i \leq n$. Similarly as before, $\mathfrak{A}, r \models [i]M(\varphi)$ if $i = m_k$ for some $k = 1, \ldots, s$. If not, then trivially $\mathfrak{A}, r \models [i]M(\varphi)$. Hence, $\mathfrak{A}, r \models M^+(\varphi)$ and so $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash M^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$, whence $\mathsf{GLP}^* \nvdash \varphi$ follows. □

Let φ be a formula from L^* and let $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ exhaust all variables from φ and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ be their respective sorts. Furthermore, let $\Theta \subseteq \omega$ be a set of modalities. Define

$$R_\Theta(\varphi) \coloneqq \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \bigwedge (\{\langle j\rangle p_i \to p_i \mid j \in \Theta, j \geq \alpha_i\} \cup \{\langle j\rangle\neg p_i \to \neg p_i \mid j \in \Theta, j > \alpha_i\})$$

and

$$R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \coloneqq R_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge \bigwedge_{j\in\Theta} [j]R_\Theta(\varphi).$$

In the following, if we claim that a one-sorted logic (like GLP) proves a many-sorted formula, we mean that the one-sorted logic proves the formula which results from the many-sorted one if we simply disregard the sorts.

Lemma 4.3. *Let φ be a many-sorted formula and let Θ be the set of all modalities occurring in φ. Then,*

$$\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi \iff \mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi.$$

Proof. The direction from right to left is immediate since $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$ and GLP^* extends GLP. For the other direction, suppose $\mathsf{GLP} \nvdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi$. It follows from results of [7] together with a result of [10] that this implies

$$\mathsf{J} \nvdash N^+(R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi) \to (R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi). \tag{1}$$

Recall that J is complete with respect to the class of all J^*-models (there called J-models). So let $\mathfrak{A} = \langle W, \{R_\alpha\}_{\alpha<\omega}, [\![\cdot]\!]\rangle$ be a J^*-model with root r such that

$$\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models N^+(R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi) \to (R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi).$$

Therefore, $\mathfrak{A}, r \models N^+(R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi)$ and $\mathfrak{A}, r \models R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$, but $\mathfrak{A}, r \not\models \varphi$. Now it follows that $\mathfrak{A}, r \models N^+(\varphi)$ by definition of $N^+(\cdot)$. Since $\mathfrak{A}, r \models R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ is rooted, it is easy to see that $\mathfrak{A}$ is strongly persistent by the construction of $R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$. (Notice that $\mathfrak{A}$ can be chosen such that $R_\alpha = \varnothing$ for all $\alpha \notin \Theta$, since the formula depicted in (1) is in the language of φ.) Therefore, $\mathsf{J}^* \nvdash N^+(\varphi) \to \varphi$ and so $\mathsf{GLP}^* \nvdash \varphi$ follows. □

We say that a logic $\mathcal{L}$ has the *Craig interpolation property* if, whenever $\mathcal{L} \vdash \varphi \to \psi$, then there is an η containing only variables which are present in φ and ψ such that both $\mathcal{L} \vdash \varphi \to \eta$ and $\mathcal{L} \vdash \eta \to \psi$.

Corollary 4.4. GLP^* *has the Craig interpolation property.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi \to \psi$. Let Θ be the set of all modalities from $\varphi \to \psi$. By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi \to \psi) \to (\varphi \to \psi).$$

Note that $R^+_\Theta(\varphi \to \psi)$ is equivalent in GLP to $R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge R^+_\Theta(\psi)$. Hence,

$$\mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge R^+_\Theta(\psi) \to (\varphi \to \psi),$$

whence by propositional logic

$$\mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge \varphi \to (R^+_\Theta(\psi) \to \psi).$$

Ignatiev [14] showed that GLP has the Craig interpolation property. Hence, there is an η containing only variables which occur in $R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge \varphi$ and $R^+_\Theta(\psi) \to \psi$ such that

$$\mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \wedge \varphi \to \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{GLP} \vdash \eta \to (R^+_\Theta(\psi) \to \psi).$$

But $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$ and $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash R^+_\Theta(\psi)$. Therefore, $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi \to \eta$ and $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \eta \to \psi$. Note that η only contains variables which occur in φ and ψ, since $R^+_\Theta(\tau)$ contains exactly the variables from τ, for any formula τ. □

Corollary 4.5. *Deciding whether* $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi$ *is complete for* PSpace.

Proof. Shapirovsky [17] showed that deciding whether $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi$ is complete for PSpace. For membership, in order to check whether $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi$, it suffices to check whether $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash R^+_\Theta(\varphi) \to \varphi$, where Θ denotes the set of modalities from φ. Note that $R^+_\Theta(\varphi)$ is polynomial in the size of φ. For hardness, reduce the task of checking whether $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi$ as follows. Let φ' be a many-sorted formula that results from φ by assigning the sort ω to all propositional variables. It is easy to see that $\mathsf{GLP} \vdash \varphi$ iff $\mathsf{GLP}^* \vdash \varphi'$ by the arithmetical completeness theorems for GLP and GLP^*. □

5 Conclusion

We have introduced a many-sorted variant, denoted GLP^*, of Japaridze's polymodal logic GLP. GLP^* is arithmetically sound and complete with respect to a broad class of arithmetical interpretations, where variables of sort below ω are interpreted as Π_n-sentences from the arithmetical hierarchy. GLP has attracted a lot of interest in the mathematical logic community due to its proof-theoretic applications. It was noticed [8, 13] that the proof-theoretic analysis of PA due to Beklemishev [3] uses only a positive fragment of GLP that consists of formulas built up from $\wedge$, $\top$, and $\langle n \rangle$. Dashkov [13] axiomatized this fragment by a positive calculus and showed that theoremhood in this calculus is decidable in polynomial time. Moreover, such positive calculi admit a richer arithmetical interpretation than full GLP: variables can be interpreted as (primitive recursive enumerations of) possibly infinite theories rather than single sentences. The conjunction of two positive formulas is then interpreted as the union of the corresponding theories. Its richer arithmetical interpretation allows for the introduction of an additional modality $\langle \omega \rangle$ that is arithmetically interpreted as the full uniform reflection principle (cf. [4, 16]). This principle has no finite, yet a recursive axiomatization. Consequently, it is possible to include the corresponding modality in the positive calculus. This line of research was followed by Beklemishev [9] who provided arithmetical completeness results for a positive calculus containing such a modality in its language. These calculi (called *reflection calculi*) can be brought into the many-sorted setting as well: variables of sort n are interpreted as Π_{n+1}-axiomatizable extensions of PA, while those of sort ω are interpreted as arbitrary ones. Arithmetical completeness results can then be obtained in a similar fashion as presented in this work. We refer the reader to [11] for details.

References

[1] Mohammad Ardeshir and S. Mojtaba Mojtahedi. Reduction of provability logics to Σ_1-provability logics. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 23(5):842–847, 2015.

[2] Sergei N. Artemov and Lev D. Beklemishev. Provability Logic. In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic, 2nd ed.*, pages 229–403. Kluwer, 2004.

[3] Lev D. Beklemishev. Provability algebras and proof-theoretic ordinals, I. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 128(1-3):103–123, 2004.

[4] Lev D. Beklemishev. *Reflection Principles and Provability Algebras in Formal Arithmetic.* Logic Group preprint series. Department of Philosophy, Utrecht Univ., 2005.

[5] Lev D. Beklemishev. The Worm Principle. In Z. Chatzidakis, P. Koepke, and W. Pohlers, editors, *Lecture Notes in Logic 27. Logic Colloquium '02*, pages 75–95. AK Peters, 2006. Preprint: Logic Group Preprint Series 219, Utrecht Univ., March 2003.

[6] Lev D. Beklemishev. Kripke semantics for provability logic GLP. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 161(6):756–774, 2010.

[7] Lev D. Beklemishev. A simplified proof of arithmetical completeness theorem for provability logic GLP. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 274(1):25–33, 2011.

[8] Lev D. Beklemishev. Calibrating provability logic: from modal logic to reflection calculus. In T. Bolander, T. Braüner, S. Ghilardi, and L. Moss, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic, v. 9*, pages 89–94. College Publications, London, 2012.

[9] Lev D. Beklemishev. Positive provability logic for uniform reflection principles. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(1):82–105, 2014.

[10] Lev D. Beklemishev, David Fernández-Duque, and Joost J. Joosten. On provability logics with linearly ordered modalities. *Studia Logica*, 102(3):541–566, 2014.

[11] Gerald Berger. Provability Interpretations of a Many-Sorted Polymodal Logic. Master's thesis, Vienna University of Technology, 2015.

[12] George S. Boolos. *The Logic of Provability.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[13] Evgeny V. Dashkov. On the positive fragment of the polymodal provability logic GLP. *Mathematical Notes*, 91(3):318–333, 2012. Original Russian text in: *Matematicheskie Zametki*, 91:(3):331–336, 2012.

[14] Konstantin N. Ignatiev. On Strong Provability Predicates and the Associated Modal Logics. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 58(1):249–290, 03 1993.

[15] Giorgi K. Japaridze. The polymodal logic of provability. In *Intensional Logics and Logical Structure of Theories: Material from the fourth Soviet-Finnish Symposium on Logic, Telavi, May 20-24, 1985, Metsniereba, Tbilisi*, pages 16–48, 1988. In Russian.

[16] Georg Kreisel and Azriel Lévy. Reflection principles and their use for establishing the complexity of axiomatic systems. *Zeitschrift f. math. Logik und Grundlagen d. Math.*, 14: 97–142, 1968.

[17] Ilya Shapirovsky. PSPACE-decidability of Japaridze's polymodal logic. In *Advances in Modal Logic*, volume 7, pages 289–304, 2008.

[18] Albert Visser. *Aspects of diagonalization and provability.* PhD thesis, Utrecht University, 1981.